

## REMARKS

Claims 8 and 14 have been amended. Claims 8 and 14 to 25 remain active in this application.

Claims 8 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. These claims have been amended to overcome the rejection.

Claims 8, 14, 15, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Taguchi (U.S. 6,052,577). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

In accordance with the present invention, a first limited coverage base station (as opposed to a mobile station) is disposed within and has a coverage range within the coverage range of a second base station. The limited coverage base station controls all operation between mobile stations within its coverage range and the second base station. This concept is set forth in claim 8 wherein, to begin with, two base stations, one base within the coverage range of the other base station are claimed as opposed to a base station and a mobile station of Taguchi. Secondly, the limited coverage base station controls all wireless mobile communications to and/or from the at least one relatively long range or large coverage base station within the short coverage area. No such feature is taught or suggested by Taguchi. In addition, the short-range base station restricts operation of communication devices disposed within the short coverage area (mobile telephones and the like) which are capable of communicating with the at least one relatively long range base station, no such feature being taught or even remotely suggested by Taguchi. It follows that claim 8 defines patentably over Taguchi under 35 U.S.C. 102.

Claim 14 requires the features discussed above with reference to claim 8, except in method format, and therefore defines patentably over Taguchi for at least the reasons presented above with reference to claim 8.

More specifically, claim 14 requires, in addition to the two base stations, a limited coverage base station within the coverage range of a relatively large coverage range base station as discussed above, the step of the short-range base station controlling all wireless mobile communications to and/or from the at least one relatively long range base station within the short coverage area. No such step is taught or suggested by Taguchi. Claim 14 still further requires the step of the short-range base station restricting operation of a communication devices disposed within the short coverage area which are capable of communicating with the at least one relatively long range base station. No such step is taught or suggested by Taguchi.

Claim 16 depends from claim 8 and therefore defines patentably over Taguchi for at least the reasons set forth above with reference to claim 8.

In addition, claim 16 further limits claim 8 by requiring that the communication devices include means responsive to the short range base station for providing at least one predetermined function at the communication devices. No such feature is taught or suggested by Taguchi either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 21 depends from claim 14 and therefore defines patentably over Taguchi for at least the reasons set forth above with reference to claim 14.

In addition, claim 21 further limits claim 14 by requiring that the communication devices include means responsive to said short range base station for providing at least

one predetermined function at said communication devices. No such feature is taught or suggested by Taguchi either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taguchi in view of Stein (U.S. 5,771,468). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 15 depends from claim 14 and therefore defines patentably over the applied references for at least the reasons presented above with reference to claim 14 since Stein fails to overcome the deficiencies in Taguchi as noted above with reference to claim 14.

In addition, claim 15 requires that the step of controlling wireless communications be provided in more than one format on more than one channel. No such combination is taught or suggested by Taguchi, Stein or any proper combination of these references.

Claims 17 to 20 and 22 to 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taguchi in view of Silva (U.S. 6, 496,703). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 17 to 20 and 22 to 25 depend from claim 14 and therefore define patentably over the applied references since Silva fails to overcome the deficiencies in Taguchi as noted above.

In addition, claim 17 further limits claim 16 by requiring that the at least one predetermined function be one of precluding audible responses at the communication devices, causing a response to be converted from an audible response to a non-audible response and altering predetermined types of communications from the communication devices to the long range base station. No such features are taught or suggested by Taguchi, Silva or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 18 further limits claim 17 by requiring that the at least one predetermined function be precluding audible responses at the communication devices. No such features are taught or suggested by Taguchi, Silva or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 19 further limits claim 17 by requiring that the at least one predetermined function be causing a response to be converted from an audible response to a non-audible response. No such features are taught or suggested by Taguchi, Silva or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 20 further limits claim 17 by requiring that the at least one predetermined function be altering predetermined types of communications from the communication devices to the long range base station. No such features are taught or suggested by Taguchi, Silva or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 22 further limits claim 21 by requiring that the at least one predetermined function be one of precluding audible responses at the communication devices, causing a response to be converted from an audible response to a non-audible response and altering predetermined types of communications from the communication devices to the long range base station. No such features are taught or suggested by Taguchi, Silva or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 23 further limits claim 22 by requiring that the at least one predetermined function be precluding audible responses at the communication devices. No such features are taught or suggested by Taguchi, Silva or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 24 further limits claim 22 by requiring that the at least one predetermined function be causing a response to be converted from an audible response to a non-audible response. No such features are taught or suggested by Taguchi, Silva or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 25 further limits claim 22 by requiring that the at least one predetermined function be altering predetermined types of communications from the communication devices to the long range base station. No such features are taught or suggested by Taguchi, Silva or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

In view of the above remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Jay M. Cantor  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 19,906

Texas Instruments Incorporated  
P. O. Box 655474, MS 3999  
Dallas, Texas 75265  
(301) 424-0355 (Phone)  
(972) 917-5293 (Phone)  
(301) 279-0038 (Fax)